

U.S.S.N. 10/707,769

-2-

HN 1008 PUS

REMARKS

According to the Office Action, the application contains five species of the claimed of invention comprising the following:

Species	Figures
1	1-5
2	6-8
3	9-12
4	13-15
5	16-17

Applicants herein elect Species I, Figures 1-5 and claims 1-8, 46, 48 and 50 with traverse.

Applicants traverse for several reasons. Initially, the Office Action states no grounds for the restriction other than they are "structurally different". The Office Action contains no support for asserting that the species are independent and distinct, or why the structural differences render the species distinct. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that the asserted species are not materially different in design, mode of operation, function or effect. The inventions are clearly capable of use together and are not materially different in design. The various belt tensioning devices are shown separately for purposes of clarity, but Applicants contemplate their use together, or in various forms as the tensioning requirements of the particular belt application under consideration demand. Nor are the species mutually exclusive of each other. For this reason, the restriction should be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that claims 1-8, 46, 48 and 50 are directed to Species I. Applicants further submit that claims within the other Species include many of the limitations within Species I. Thus, Applicants reserve the right to amend the elected claims or to add dependent claims to include the limitations recited in claims 9-45, 47, 49 and 51-60 as deemed necessary. Applicants should not be prohibited from adding claims to these features in any combination. Applicants could elect Species II, which includes many of the limitations of Species I and II, but Applicants do not want to be unjustly limited to such an election. Thus, the possible future inclusion of the non-

U.S.S.N. 10/707,769

-3-

HN 1008 PUS


elected limitations in the elected claims or in dependent form would not unduly burden the Examiner any more than would the initial election of a species that included the same. For this additional reason, the restriction should be withdrawn.

Applicants reserve the right to add the non-elected claims upon the allowance of a generic claim containing the same general inventive concept as the non-elected claims. Currently, claim 1 is noted as being generic.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (248) 223-9500 if any unresolved matters remain with respect to this Response.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By: 
Robert P. Renke
Registration No. 40,783
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, Michigan 48034
Phone: (248) 223-9500

Dated: January 31, 2007